

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE

JACOB FALLICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	1:25-cv-00061-SDN
	)	
RANDALL LIBERTY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

On May 13, 2025, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the court, with copies to the Plaintiff, his Recommended Decision after a preliminary review of Plaintiff’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (ECF No. 12). The time within which to file objections has expired, and Plaintiff did not file an objection. The Magistrate Judge notified Plaintiff that failure to object would waive his right to *de novo* review and appeal. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 12) is hereby **AFFIRMED** and **ADOPTED**. It is further **ORDERED** that all Plaintiff’s claims against all defendants, except those claims against Defendant Hoskins, are **DISMISSED**.

Also before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion for the Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 13). Citing 18 U.S.C. § 3006A, Plaintiff requests appointment of counsel because he is indigent, “the severity of this case demands counsel,” and the “time constraints of filings would be difficult” for him. ECF No. 13 at 2. The statute cited by Plaintiff applies only to appointment of counsel for criminal defendants. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3006A. As this is a civil case, Plaintiff’s Motion for the Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 13) is **DENIED**.

**So ORDERED.**

Dated this 16th day of June, 2025.

/s/ Stacey D. Neumann  
**U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE**